Real-Time Seismic Monitoring for Early Detection of Tactical Nuclear Events in Global Conflict Zones

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

February 24, 2026

In an era marked by escalating geopolitical tensions, particularly in regions like the Middle East and Ukraine, the threat of tactical nuclear warfare looms larger than ever. Traditional radiation monitoring, while essential for tracking fallout, often suffers from data lags, regional gaps, and vulnerability to disruptions. Seismic monitoring emerges as a superior alternative, offering near-instantaneous detection of explosive events through global networks of sensors. These systems capture shockwaves from nuclear detonations, distinguishing them from natural earthquakes via unique signatures such as dominant P-waves and shallow depths. This paper explores the resilience and efficacy of real-time seismic tools in monitoring potential nuclear incidents. Drawing from international frameworks like the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) and citizen science initiatives, it highlights how these technologies provide early warnings, even in data-scarce areas. By integrating official dashboards with decentralized platforms, users can access live data to assess risks promptly. The discussion underscores the importance of seismic data in crisis scenarios, where rapid interpretation can inform diplomatic, military, and humanitarian responses. As conflicts intensify, understanding these monitoring capabilities is crucial for policymakers, researchers, and the public. This work aims to bridge the gap between technical systems and practical application, emphasizing redundancy and accessibility to enhance global security in an uncertain world. (198 words)

Keywords: seismic monitoring, nuclear detection, real-time data, tactical nuclear events, conflict zones, Middle East, Ukraine, CTBTO, IRIS, USGS, explosion signatures, global networks.

A collaboration with Grok, xAI, 2026. CC4.0.

Outline

1. Historical Context of Nuclear Monitoring in Conflict Zones This section reviews the evolution of nuclear detection technologies, from Cold War-era systems to modern digital networks, with case studies from past events like North Korean tests and the Beirut explosion.

2. Limitations of Radiation Monitoring Systems Analysis of why radiation-based tools, such as IAEA IRMIS and EPA RadNet, fall short in real-time scenarios, including data gaps in the Middle East and delays in plume detection.

3. Advantages of Seismic Detection for Tactical Nuclear Events Explanation of seismic principles, including wave types (P-waves, S-waves) and how they reveal explosion characteristics versus natural seismic activity.

4. Key International Seismic Networks: CTBTO IMS Detailed overview of the CTBTO's global infrastructure, its multi-technology approach, and specific relevance to Middle Eastern and Ukrainian monitoring.

5. IRIS Station Monitor: Tools for Detailed Waveform Analysis Guide to using IRIS for real-time station-specific data, including key stations near conflict borders and customization tips for event identification.

6. USGS and Global Earthquake Monitoring Integration Examination of USGS resources for automated event detection and their synergy with other networks for comprehensive coverage.

7. European and Regional Systems: GEOFON and Beyond Focus on GEOFON's role in Mediterranean and Eastern European monitoring, with comparisons to other regional tools.

8. Decentralized and Citizen Science Approaches: Raspberry Shake Network Discussion of grassroots platforms for redundancy, their resilience in disrupted environments, and global distribution challenges.

9. Interpreting Seismic Data: Distinguishing Explosions from Earthquakes Step-by-step methods for analyzing waveforms, depths, and signatures, with practical examples from historical data.

10. Case Studies: Application in Middle East and Ukraine Conflicts Real-world applications, including seismic insights from ongoing tensions and hypothetical scenarios for tactical nuclear use.

11. Future Directions and Technological Enhancements Emerging trends like AI integration, satellite augmentation, and policy recommendations for improving global access.

12. Conclusion and Policy Implications Synthesis of findings, emphasizing the need for public education and international cooperation in seismic monitoring for nuclear risk mitigation.

References

Art

1. Historical Context of Nuclear Monitoring in Conflict Zones

The development of nuclear detection technologies has been inextricably linked to the geopolitical tensions of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, evolving from rudimentary scientific discoveries to sophisticated global networks capable of real-time surveillance. The foundations were laid in the late nineteenth century with the discovery of radioactivity by Henri Becquerel in 1896 and the subsequent isolation of radium by Marie and Pierre Curie in 1898. These breakthroughs paved the way for understanding atomic structure, culminating in Ernest Rutherford's model of the atom in 1911 and his speculation on the neutron in 1920. By the 1930s, the potential for nuclear fission was realized, setting the stage for weaponization during World War II.

The Manhattan Project, initiated in 1942, marked the birth of nuclear weapons, with the first test, Trinity, detonated in New Mexico on July 16, 1945. This event not only demonstrated the destructive power of atomic bombs but also highlighted the need for monitoring such activities. Post-war, the Cold War arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union intensified nuclear testing. The U.S. conducted its initial tests in the Pacific, while the Soviets detonated their first device in 1949, sparking a proliferation of atmospheric and underground explosions. Early detection relied on basic tools like Geiger counters and ground-based seismic stations, which captured shockwaves from blasts. Atmospheric tests, numbering over 500 by superpowers alone, released massive radiation, prompting international concern and the 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty, which shifted testing underground to reduce fallout.

As testing went subterranean, seismic monitoring became paramount. The 1950s and 1960s saw the deployment of seismic arrays and satellite surveillance, such as the U.S. VELA program, designed to verify compliance with treaties. These systems evolved into digital networks in the late twentieth century, incorporating hydroacoustic, infrasound, and radionuclide sensors for comprehensive detection. The establishment of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization in 1996 formalized this with the International Monitoring System, comprising over 300 facilities worldwide to detect even low-yield events.

Case studies illustrate the practical application and refinement of these technologies in conflict zones. North Korea's nuclear tests from 2006 to 2017 provide a modern example. The first test on October 9, 2006, registered a seismic magnitude of about 4.2, equivalent to a yield under 1 kiloton, detected by global seismic stations. Subsequent tests, including the 2017 event with a magnitude over 6, showcased improvements in yield estimation and discrimination between explosions and earthquakes through analysis of P-wave dominance and shallow depths. These detections by the International Monitoring System confirmed explosive characteristics, aiding international responses despite regional data challenges.

In contrast, the 2020 Beirut port explosion, though non-nuclear, offers insight into seismic signatures of large chemical blasts. Caused by 2,750 tons of ammonium nitrate, it generated a seismic event of magnitude 3.3, with shockwaves felt up to 240 kilometers away. The waveform showed a sharp P-wave burst followed by a tapering tail, mimicking nuclear explosions but distinguishable by context and lack of radiation. This event underscored seismic monitoring's utility in differentiating man-made disasters in volatile regions like the Middle East.

Overall, the transition from Cold War-era analog systems to today's integrated digital frameworks has enhanced the ability to monitor nuclear activities in conflict-prone areas, providing critical data for verification and deterrence. This historical progression emphasizes seismic methods' role in maintaining global security amid ongoing threats.

2. Limitations of Radiation Monitoring Systems

Radiation monitoring systems have long been a cornerstone of nuclear safety and environmental protection, designed to detect and measure ionizing radiation from sources such as nuclear reactors, accidents, or weapons. These tools aggregate data from fixed sensors, mobile detectors, and satellite observations to provide insights into radiation levels across various scales. Prominent examples include the International Atomic Energy Agency's International Radiation Monitoring Information System, which serves as a global platform for sharing emergency data among member states, and the United States Environmental Protection Agency's RadNet, which focuses on real-time gamma radiation monitoring through a network of over 140 air monitors nationwide. Other systems, such as the European Union's European Radiological Data Exchange Platform and regional initiatives like Ukraine's SaveEcoBot, complement these by offering localized or crowdsourced data integration.

Despite their importance, radiation-based monitoring tools exhibit significant limitations, particularly in real-time scenarios involving tactical nuclear events in conflict zones. One primary issue is the inherent delay in detection and reporting. Radiation plumes from a nuclear detonation or release do not manifest instantaneously; they require time to disperse through atmospheric or environmental pathways before reaching sensors. In the case of a tactical nuclear strike, initial fallout might take minutes to hours to travel, depending on wind patterns, altitude, and yield. This temporal lag means that systems like RadNet, which update every hour or so, may not capture the event until after the initial blast, rendering them reactive rather than proactive. For instance, during simulated exercises, plume models show that detection could be postponed by up to several hours in remote or sparsely monitored areas, allowing critical response windows to close.

Data gaps represent another critical shortfall, especially in regions like the Middle East where geopolitical sensitivities and regulatory barriers hinder comprehensive coverage. Strict government controls on importing radiation detection equipment, such as Geiger counters, limit the proliferation of both official and citizen-based sensors. As a result, public dashboards like Radmon.org or Safecast, which rely on volunteer contributions, show sparse or nonexistent data points in countries such as Iran, Syria, or parts of the Arabian Peninsula. The International Radiation Monitoring Information System, while authoritative, depends on voluntary national reporting, which can be delayed, censored, or incomplete during conflicts. In Ukraine, while SaveEcoBot provides denser coverage through integration with government and independent networks, similar systems in the Middle East are undermined by a lack of hobbyist culture and infrastructure, creating "blind spots" that could obscure the early signs of a nuclear incident.

Furthermore, these systems are vulnerable to disruptions that exacerbate their limitations in crisis situations. Centralized platforms may succumb to cyberattacks, power outages, or physical destruction of ground-based sensors, as seen in hypothetical war gaming scenarios. Decentralized networks offer some redundancy, but their reliance on internet connectivity and user participation makes them susceptible to widespread blackouts or jamming in active conflict zones. Environmental factors, such as dust storms in the Middle East or extreme weather, can also interfere with sensor accuracy or data transmission.

In summary, while radiation monitoring tools excel in long-term environmental tracking and post-event analysis, their delays in plume detection, regional data voids, and susceptibility to interference make them inadequate for the immediacy required in tactical nuclear monitoring. This underscores the need for complementary approaches that can provide faster, more resilient indicators of explosive events.

3. Advantages of Seismic Detection for Tactical Nuclear Events

Seismic detection stands out as a highly effective method for identifying tactical nuclear events, offering several key advantages over other monitoring approaches, particularly in the context of rapid-response needs during conflicts. Unlike radiation-based systems that depend on the dispersal of fallout particles, seismic monitoring captures the immediate mechanical energy released by an explosion through the Earth's crust. This allows for near-instantaneous alerts, often within seconds to minutes, enabling quicker assessment and reaction in volatile regions. The global distribution of seismic stations, many of which are hardened against environmental and human-induced disruptions, provides extensive coverage even in areas with limited access or data restrictions. Moreover, seismic data is difficult to censor or suppress, as waves

propagate through the planet's interior and can be recorded by distant sensors, making it resilient in scenarios where local infrastructure might be compromised.

At the core of seismic detection are fundamental principles of wave propagation generated by sudden energy releases. When a tactical nuclear device detonates, it creates a localized, high-pressure shock that radiates outward as seismic waves. These waves are categorized into body waves, which travel through the Earth's interior, and surface waves, which move along the crust. Body waves are the most informative for event characterization and include primary waves, or P-waves, and secondary waves, or S-waves.

P-waves are compressional in nature, meaning they push and pull particles in the direction of wave travel, similar to sound waves in air. They are the fastest seismic waves, typically traveling at speeds of 5 to 8 kilometers per second in the crust, allowing them to arrive first at monitoring stations. This speed contributes to the real-time advantage of seismic systems. In contrast, S-waves are shear waves that move particles perpendicular to the direction of propagation, like a side-to-side shaking motion. They travel slower, at about 3 to 4.5 kilometers per second, and cannot pass through fluids, which limits their path in certain Earth layers.

The distinct characteristics of these waves reveal crucial differences between nuclear explosions and natural seismic activity. Explosions, including tactical nuclear ones, act as point sources that release energy isotropically, or equally in all directions. This results in a seismic signature dominated by strong P-waves, which manifest as a sharp, impulsive spike on seismograms. The compression from the blast efficiently generates these waves, while the lack of significant shearing motion leads to weak or absent S-waves. Additionally, nuclear events are typically shallow, occurring at depths less than 2 kilometers for surface or near-surface detonations, producing simpler waveforms with a rapid onset and tapering tail. The uniformity of first motions—where all stations record an initial upward or compressional push—further confirms an explosive origin.

Natural earthquakes, however, stem from tectonic forces causing slips along fault lines, involving primarily shear movements. This generates robust S-waves that often exceed P-wave amplitudes, creating more complex and prolonged waveforms with multiple phases. Earthquake depths vary widely, from shallow crustal events at 10 kilometers to deep subduction zone quakes at over 700 kilometers, influencing wave patterns and attenuation. The first motions in earthquakes are quadrantally distributed, with some stations showing compression and others dilation, depending on their position relative to the fault orientation.

These distinctions enable analysts to discriminate between event types with high confidence, even for low-yield tactical nukes that might register magnitudes as small as 2 or 3. In conflict zones like the Middle East or Ukraine, where radiation sensors may be sparse or disrupted,

seismic detection provides an early, unambiguous indicator. For example, the ability to triangulate epicenters using arrival times from multiple stations adds locational precision, enhancing strategic value. Overall, the principles of seismic wave analysis not only highlight explosions but also support broader risk assessment, making this method indispensable for modern nuclear monitoring.

4. Key International Seismic Networks: CTBTO IMS

The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization represents a pivotal international effort to curb nuclear proliferation through advanced monitoring capabilities. Established in 1996 following the adoption of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, the organization oversees the International Monitoring System, a sophisticated global network designed to detect and verify nuclear explosions anywhere on Earth. Although the treaty has not yet entered into force due to pending ratifications from key states, the International Monitoring System operates continuously, providing data to over 180 member states for scientific, civil, and verification purposes. This system exemplifies collaborative international science, involving contributions from host countries and experts worldwide to maintain operational integrity.

The global infrastructure of the International Monitoring System is expansive and resilient, comprising 321 monitoring facilities when fully built, with approximately 90 percent certified and functional as of recent assessments. These facilities are strategically distributed across all continents, oceans, and remote islands to ensure comprehensive coverage, including hard-to-reach areas. The network's design prioritizes redundancy and robustness, with stations engineered to withstand extreme conditions such as earthquakes, harsh weather, and potential sabotage. Data from these stations flows in real-time to the International Data Centre in Vienna, Austria, where automated algorithms process signals for event detection, followed by expert review. This centralized yet distributed architecture minimizes single points of failure, making it highly suitable for monitoring in conflict zones where local disruptions might occur.

At the heart of the International Monitoring System is its multi-technology approach, integrating four complementary detection methods to achieve high-confidence verification. Seismic monitoring forms the backbone, with 50 primary and 120 auxiliary stations that record ground vibrations from explosions. These stations use broadband seismometers to capture a wide frequency range, enabling the detection of events as small as magnitude 3 or lower in most regions. Hydroacoustic technology, consisting of 11 stations, listens for underwater sound waves, crucial for detecting subsea or near-coastal detonations through the efficient propagation of sound in water. Infrasound monitoring, with 60 stations, detects low-frequency atmospheric pressure waves generated by above-ground or near-surface explosions, which can

travel thousands of kilometers without significant attenuation. Finally, radionuclide monitoring involves 80 stations equipped with air samplers and analyzers to detect radioactive particles and noble gases, such as xenon isotopes, which are definitive indicators of nuclear fission. This layered methodology allows cross-verification: for instance, a seismic signal might alert to an event, while infrasound confirms its atmospheric nature and radionuclides provide isotopic proof of nuclear origin.

The system's relevance to monitoring in the Middle East and Ukraine is particularly pronounced due to ongoing geopolitical tensions and the potential for tactical nuclear use in these areas. In the Middle East, where data gaps plague other monitoring methods, the International Monitoring System maintains key stations that serve as sentinels. Radionuclide facilities in Kuwait, Oman, and Jordan are positioned to sample air masses from potential Iranian or regional sites, detecting fission products that might evade local censorship. Seismic stations in nearby Turkey and Cyprus act as perimeter monitors, capturing shockwaves from any explosive activity in the Levant or Persian Gulf. For Ukraine, the system's Eastern European coverage includes auxiliary seismic stations in Romania and Kazakhstan, which can detect events across the conflict zone. Hydroacoustic stations in the Black Sea region complement this by monitoring for any maritime-related incidents. In both areas, the multi-technology integration enhances detection amid challenges like sparse local sensors or electronic warfare. For example, in hypothetical scenarios involving low-yield tactical devices, the system's ability to combine seismic waveforms with infrasound data could pinpoint locations and yields rapidly, informing international responses.

In essence, the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization's International Monitoring System embodies a forward-thinking framework for nuclear deterrence, its global reach and technological diversity making it indispensable for safeguarding against threats in sensitive regions like the Middle East and Ukraine.

5. IRIS Station Monitor: Tools for Detailed Waveform Analysis

The Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology Station Monitor is a powerful, publicly accessible tool that provides detailed, real-time seismic data from a vast array of global stations. Managed by a consortium of universities and research institutions, this platform aggregates continuous ground motion recordings from hundreds of seismometers worldwide, making it an essential resource for monitoring potential tactical nuclear events. Unlike broader earthquake catalogs that summarize events post-detection, the Station Monitor focuses on station-specific waveforms, allowing users to observe raw data as it unfolds. This granularity is particularly valuable in conflict zones, where immediate analysis of subtle signals can differentiate between

natural phenomena and man-made explosions. The tool's interface is user-friendly, compatible with both desktop and mobile devices, and requires no specialized software, democratizing access for researchers, policymakers, and informed citizens.

To utilize the IRIS Station Monitor for real-time data, users begin by navigating to the interactive map view, which displays station locations as icons—circles or triangles—clustered in high-density areas. Zooming into regions of interest reveals individual stations, each linked to a dashboard upon selection. The core feature is the Webicorder display, which presents the last 24 hours of ground motion as a series of horizontal lines, with each line representing one hour of data. The most recent activity appears at the bottom, marked by a red vertical line indicating current Universal Time Coordinated. This setup enables users to scan for anomalies, such as sudden spikes that might indicate an explosive event, without waiting for official bulletins.

Key stations near conflict borders enhance the tool's relevance for areas like the Middle East and Ukraine. In the Middle East, stations such as EIL in Eilat, Israel, provide coverage for the Levant, capturing vibrations from potential activities in Syria or the eastern Mediterranean. JSO in Jordan monitors the Arabian Peninsula's western edge, ideal for detecting events in Iraq or Saudi border regions. Further east, RAYN in Ar Rayn, Saudi Arabia, serves as a sentinel for the Persian Gulf, sensitive to disturbances from Iran. These stations are strategically placed to triangulate epicenters, offering locational accuracy within kilometers for moderate-magnitude events. For Ukraine, perimeter stations are crucial due to ongoing hostilities. MAKZ in Kazakhstan detects eastern propagations, while AKASG in Malin, Ukraine, provides direct internal coverage. BURAR in Romania acts as a western buffer, recording waves crossing the Carpathians. By monitoring these stations in tandem, users can track shockwave arrivals and infer event origins, compensating for any local sensor disruptions.

Customization tips further optimize the Station Monitor for event identification, transforming raw data into actionable insights. Enabling the auto-refresh feature in advanced settings ensures the display updates every five to ten minutes, maintaining currency during fast-evolving situations. For noise reduction, apply the 1 Hz high-pass filter via the top-right menu; this eliminates low-frequency interferences like ocean microseisms or cultural noise from traffic, sharpening signals from distant explosions. Users can also adjust the amplitude scale to focus on subtle events, zooming in on specific time segments for closer inspection. In identifying tactical nuclear signatures, look for abrupt, high-amplitude P-wave bursts—tall vertical deflections—with minimal S-wave follow-through, contrasting the oscillatory patterns of earthquakes. A simple, impulsive waveform with a quick decay often points to an explosion, especially if correlated across multiple stations. For deeper analysis, export data segments for offline processing, though the real-time view suffices for initial assessments.

In practice, these tools empower proactive monitoring, bridging the gap between global networks and localized threats. By leveraging station-specific data and custom filters, the IRIS Station Monitor not only detects events but also aids in their characterization, bolstering security in high-risk zones.

6. USGS and Global Earthquake Monitoring Integration

The United States Geological Survey plays a central role in global earthquake monitoring, serving as a hub for automated detection, data dissemination, and international collaboration. As part of the Department of the Interior, the USGS Earthquake Hazards Program oversees a suite of resources dedicated to tracking seismic activity worldwide, with an emphasis on rapid response to mitigate hazards. This includes the National Earthquake Information Center, which processes millions of seismic signals annually to produce timely alerts. In the context of tactical nuclear event detection, USGS tools are invaluable for their speed and precision, identifying anomalous shocks that could indicate explosions rather than tectonic shifts. By integrating domestic capabilities with global partnerships, the USGS enhances comprehensive coverage, particularly in underserved or conflict-prone regions where standalone networks might falter.

At the forefront of USGS resources is the Global Seismographic Network, a collaborative effort with the Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology that deploys over 150 high-fidelity stations across the planet. These stations, equipped with broadband seismometers and strong-motion accelerometers, capture a broad spectrum of ground motions, from subtle tremors to major ruptures. The network's design ensures data quality through real-time telemetry, allowing continuous streaming to central servers. Automated event detection is a hallmark of USGS operations, employing sophisticated algorithms such as the Earthworm system and the Advanced National Seismic System. These tools scan incoming waveforms for patterns indicative of seismic events, using techniques like short-term average over long-term average ratios to flag potential triggers. Once detected, events are located via triangulation of P-wave arrival times and assigned magnitudes through moment tensor inversions or body-wave calculations. This process often yields preliminary reports within minutes, crucial for distinguishing explosive sources that exhibit compact, shallow signatures from the more distributed patterns of earthquakes.

The Latest Earthquakes Map exemplifies USGS's commitment to accessible, real-time monitoring. This interactive platform displays global events on a dynamic map, color-coded by magnitude and age, with filters for time, depth, and region. Users can drill down to individual events for details like epicenter coordinates, depth, and associated waveforms. While primarily labeled as earthquakes, the system captures any significant seismic disturbance, including

quarry blasts or potential nuclear tests, which appear as outliers in depth or waveform simplicity. Complementary services, such as the Earthquake Notification Service, deliver customizable alerts via email or app, enabling stakeholders to respond proactively to emerging threats in areas like the Middle East or Ukraine.

The true strength of USGS resources lies in their synergy with other global networks, creating a unified framework for enhanced detection and verification. Data from the Global Seismographic Network feeds directly into the International Monitoring System of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, where USGS stations contribute to seismic arrays for nuclear test verification. This integration allows cross-validation: a suspicious event flagged by USGS algorithms can be corroborated by the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization's infrasound or radionuclide data. Similarly, USGS collaborates with the Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology Station Monitor, sharing waveforms that users can analyze in tandem for detailed event characterization. In Europe, linkages with GEOFON enable seamless data exchange, bolstering coverage in the Mediterranean and Eastern regions. For decentralized redundancy, USGS data informs citizen science platforms like the Raspberry Shake Network, where amateur stations fill gaps in official arrays.

This interconnected approach addresses coverage limitations in conflict zones. In the Middle East, where political barriers restrict local sensors, USGS relies on perimeter stations in allied countries to monitor propagations from Iran or Syria. For Ukraine, integration with Eastern European networks ensures detection of frontline explosions, differentiating artillery from larger threats. Overall, the USGS's automated tools and collaborative ethos provide a robust layer of global monitoring, amplifying the ability to identify tactical nuclear events amid natural seismic noise.

7. European and Regional Systems: GEOFON and Beyond

European and regional seismic systems play a vital role in bridging the gap between global networks and localized monitoring, offering high-resolution data tailored to specific geographic and tectonic contexts. Among these, GEOFON stands out as a premier real-time earthquake monitoring program operated by the GFZ German Research Centre for Geosciences in Potsdam, Germany. Launched in the 1990s as part of international efforts to enhance global seismology, GEOFON maintains a virtual network of over 1,000 broadband stations contributed by partner institutions worldwide. This collaborative model leverages data from diverse sources, including national observatories and research arrays, to provide automated event detection and dissemination. The system's core software, SeisComP, processes incoming waveforms in real-time, enabling rapid location, magnitude estimation, and bulletin generation. This makes

GEOFON particularly adept at handling the dense seismic activity in Europe and its peripheries, where tectonic complexity demands swift and accurate responses.

GEOFON's role in Mediterranean monitoring is especially pronounced, given the region's active plate boundaries and history of devastating earthquakes. The Mediterranean basin, encompassing subduction zones along the Hellenic Arc and strike-slip faults in the Anatolian region, generates frequent events that can propagate into the Middle East. GEOFON's high-density coverage here includes stations in Greece, Turkey, Italy, and North Africa, allowing for precise epicenter determination within minutes. For instance, in areas bordering the Middle East, such as Cyprus and southern Turkey, the network detects shallow shocks that might indicate explosive activities, with sensitivity to magnitudes as low as 2 in well-instrumented zones. This capability extends to tracking aftershocks or swarms that could mask or mimic tactical events, providing a perimeter surveillance for less-accessible countries like Syria or Lebanon. In Eastern Europe, GEOFON excels in monitoring the Carpathian and Balkan regions, crucial for Ukraine-related conflicts. Stations in Romania, Bulgaria, and Poland form a robust grid, capturing propagations from the Black Sea and Crimean areas. The system's integration with local agencies ensures data redundancy, vital amid potential infrastructure disruptions from warfare.

Beyond its detection prowess, GEOFON offers user-friendly tools for real-time access, including an interactive earthquake bulletin that lists recent events with maps, depths, and magnitudes. RSS feeds and Telegram bots deliver instant notifications, while APIs allow programmatic querying of waveforms. These features facilitate event discrimination, such as identifying explosion-like impulses through moment tensor analysis, which decomposes waveforms to reveal source mechanisms.

Comparisons to other regional tools highlight GEOFON's strengths and synergies. The European-Mediterranean Seismological Centre, based in France, provides a complementary service with its crowdsourced "felt reports" and rapid alerts, drawing from over 150 agencies for a consensus-based catalog. While GEOFON emphasizes automated speed—often reporting within five minutes—the European-Mediterranean Seismological Centre excels in integrating citizen data for impact assessment, making it ideal for post-event humanitarian responses in the Mediterranean. In Italy, the National Institute of Geophysics and Volcanology operates a dense network focused on volcanic and tectonic hotspots, offering higher local resolution than GEOFON but with narrower geographic scope. For Eastern Europe, the Romanian National Institute for Earth Physics mirrors GEOFON's real-time capabilities but specializes in Black Sea seismicity, providing finer-grained data for Ukraine's borders.

The Observatories and Research Facilities for European Seismology infrastructure further enhances regional cohesion by archiving and distributing broadband data, fostering

interoperability among these systems. In contrast to global giants like the United States Geological Survey, which prioritize worldwide overviews, GEOFON and its peers deliver tailored, high-fidelity insights for Europe and adjacent zones. This regional focus ensures better handling of cultural noise and microseismicity, improving explosion detection amid natural events. Ultimately, these systems form a layered defense, with GEOFON's broad reach and tools making it a cornerstone for monitoring threats in the Mediterranean and Eastern Europe.

8. Decentralized and Citizen Science Approaches: Raspberry Shake Network

Decentralized and citizen science approaches to seismic monitoring represent a paradigm shift from traditional, centralized systems, empowering individuals and communities to contribute to global data collection. These grassroots platforms leverage affordable technology and volunteer participation to create dense, resilient networks that complement official infrastructures. By distributing sensors across private homes, schools, and public spaces, they introduce redundancy that is particularly valuable in disrupted environments, where government-operated stations might fail due to conflict, natural disasters, or cyberattacks. This bottom-up model not only democratizes access to seismic data but also fosters public engagement in science, enhancing awareness of geophysical risks. Among these initiatives, the Raspberry Shake Network exemplifies the potential of citizen science, transforming hobbyist efforts into a robust tool for real-time event detection, including those relevant to tactical nuclear monitoring.

The Raspberry Shake Network, initiated in 2016 by a team of seismologists and engineers, utilizes low-cost, Raspberry Pi-based seismographs to build a worldwide array of over 2,000 stations in more than 70 countries. These compact devices, often no larger than a credit card, incorporate sensitive geophones or accelerometers to measure ground motion across a frequency range suitable for detecting local and distant events. Users assemble or purchase the units, connect them to the internet via Wi-Fi or Ethernet, and contribute data through a simple app or web interface. The network's StationView dashboard aggregates this information into an interactive global map, displaying real-time waveforms, event alerts, and historical trends. Automated algorithms process the crowd-sourced data to identify anomalies, with community forums enabling collaborative validation. This setup allows for the detection of small-magnitude events, down to local scales, that might evade sparser professional networks.

A key strength of the Raspberry Shake Network lies in its resilience within disrupted environments. Unlike centralized systems that rely on dedicated power grids and secure facilities, these citizen-deployed sensors operate on standard household electricity or batteries, with many models featuring solar options for off-grid use. In conflict zones, where infrastructure sabotage or electronic jamming could silence official stations, the decentralized nature ensures

continuity: if one node goes offline, others persist, maintaining partial coverage. The network's peer-to-peer data sharing minimizes dependence on single servers, reducing vulnerability to denial-of-service attacks. During events like the 2023 Turkey-Syria earthquakes, Raspberry Shake units provided supplementary data amid overwhelmed national systems, demonstrating their utility in crisis response. For tactical nuclear scenarios, this resilience translates to sustained monitoring of explosion-induced shocks, as the distributed sensors can capture P-wave arrivals even if regional communications falter.

However, global distribution challenges temper the network's effectiveness, particularly in high-risk areas. Adoption is uneven, with dense clusters in North America, Europe, and parts of Asia, but sparsity in the Middle East and Africa due to economic barriers, regulatory hurdles, and limited STEM education outreach. In regions like Ukraine, while some units exist in urban centers, rural conflict zones lack coverage, creating blind spots for perimeter detection. Shipping restrictions on electronics and internet access issues further hinder expansion in sanctioned or remote locales. Data quality variability poses another obstacle, as amateur calibrations may introduce noise, requiring sophisticated filtering at the aggregation level. To address these, the project offers educational resources and partnerships with local organizations, but scaling remains a work in progress.

Comparisons to other grassroots platforms underscore the Raspberry Shake's niche. Initiatives like the Quake-Catcher Network, which uses laptop accelerometers, emphasize ubiquity but suffer from device mobility issues. Community Seismic Network in California focuses on urban density for early warning, while global apps like MyShake integrate smartphone sensors for crowd-sourced alerts. These platforms share redundancy benefits but vary in sensor accuracy and coverage. Collectively, they enhance official systems by filling gaps, though standardization efforts are needed to integrate citizen data seamlessly.

In conclusion, decentralized approaches like the Raspberry Shake Network bolster seismic monitoring's robustness, offering vital redundancy in uncertain times. By overcoming distribution challenges through innovation and inclusion, they hold promise for comprehensive global vigilance against tactical threats.

9. Interpreting Seismic Data: Distinguishing Explosions from Earthquakes

Interpreting seismic data is a critical skill for differentiating between natural earthquakes and man-made explosions, such as those from tactical nuclear devices. This process relies on analyzing key attributes like waveforms, depths, and overall signatures, which reveal the source mechanism. By following a structured, step-by-step approach, analysts can achieve high accuracy, even with real-time data from networks like the International Monitoring System or

the Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology. The method begins with data acquisition and progresses through visual and quantitative evaluation, incorporating tools like filters and moment tensor inversions for refinement. Historical examples illustrate how these techniques have been applied successfully, providing practical insights into their effectiveness.

The first step involves acquiring and visualizing the waveform data from selected stations. Access seismograms from dashboards such as the IRIS Webicorder or USGS event pages, focusing on the time window around the suspected event. Apply a high-pass filter, typically at 1 Hz, to remove low-frequency noise from distant sources or environmental factors, clarifying the signal. Examine the initial arrivals: identify the P-wave onset as the first sharp deflection, followed by any S-wave components. For explosions, expect a prominent, compressive P-wave with a steep rise time, indicating isotropic energy release from a point source. Earthquakes, conversely, often show a more gradual buildup with significant shear components.

Next, assess the relative amplitudes and complexities of the waves. Measure the P-to-S wave ratio; explosions typically exhibit P-waves that dominate by a factor of two or more, with subdued S-waves due to minimal shearing. Quantify this using amplitude spectra, where explosive sources display higher frequency content in the initial pulse. Waveform simplicity is another indicator: explosion seismograms tend to be impulsive with a single main phase and quick decay, resembling a bell curve, while earthquakes produce multi-phased, oscillatory traces from fault propagation. Cross-reference data from multiple stations to check for consistency; uniform first motions (all compressional or dilational) across azimuths point to an explosion, whereas earthquakes show quadrant patterns based on focal mechanisms.

Depth estimation follows as a crucial discriminator. Use travel-time differences between P and S waves, or more advanced methods like depth-phase modeling, to calculate source depth. Tactical nuclear explosions are inherently shallow, usually under 2 kilometers for surface bursts or shallow burials, leading to stronger surface waves and less attenuation. Earthquakes occur at varied depths, with most tectonic events between 10 and 700 kilometers, altering wave paths and reducing high-frequency signals at depth. Shallow depths combined with explosive waveforms raise suspicion of anthropogenic activity.

Finally, integrate additional signatures for confirmation. Compute the seismic moment tensor to model the source type: explosions yield isotropic tensors, while earthquakes show double-couple (shear) dominance. Spectral ratios, such as mb:Ms (body-wave to surface-wave magnitude), are lower for explosions due to inefficient surface wave generation. If available, correlate with non-seismic data like infrasound for atmospheric coupling.

Practical examples from historical data underscore these methods. North Korea's 2017 nuclear test, with a magnitude over 6, displayed a classic explosive signature: dominant P-waves, weak

S-waves, and a shallow depth under 1 kilometer, as analyzed from global stations. The waveform's impulsivity and uniform first motions confirmed its nuclear nature, distinguishing it from nearby earthquakes. Similarly, the 2020 Beirut ammonium nitrate explosion registered magnitude 3.3 with a sharp P-wave burst and tapering tail, at near-zero depth, mimicking nuclear traits but differentiated by context. In contrast, the 2011 Tohoku earthquake showed complex, deep (30 kilometers) waveforms with strong S-waves and quadrantally varying motions, typical of tectonic slips.

By methodically applying these steps, seismic data interpretation enables reliable event classification, essential for timely responses in conflict scenarios. Mastery of these techniques enhances the utility of monitoring networks, contributing to global stability.

10. Case Studies: Application in Middle East and Ukraine Conflicts

Case studies from the Middle East and Ukraine illustrate the practical application of seismic monitoring in conflict zones, where it provides invaluable insights into explosive events amid ongoing tensions. These examples highlight how seismic networks detect and analyze real-world incidents, from conventional warfare to natural phenomena mistaken for nuclear activities. By examining historical and recent data, we can appreciate seismic methods' role in verification and deterrence. Additionally, hypothetical scenarios for tactical nuclear use demonstrate how these tools could offer early warnings, emphasizing their strategic importance in regions fraught with geopolitical risks.

In Ukraine, seismic monitoring has been instrumental in tracking the ongoing conflict with Russia, which escalated in 2022 and continues into 2026. The Malyn seismic array, part of the International Monitoring System, has recorded thousands of explosions from artillery, missiles, and airstrikes, enabling near-real-time identification of attacks. For instance, data from this array has distinguished high-explosive impacts by their impulsive waveforms and shallow depths, often correlating with reported military actions. A notable case occurred on January 9, 2026, when Russia launched an Oreshnik intermediate-range ballistic missile at Lviv Oblast. Initial claims suggested the strike caused a seismic event equivalent to a magnitude 3 earthquake, but analysis from the Ukrainian Main Center for Special Monitoring and international agencies like the United States Geological Survey revealed no such tremor. Instead, the missile's impact generated minor ground vibrations undetectable as an earthquake, debunking misinformation and highlighting seismic data's role in countering propaganda. Earlier, in 2023, seismic arrays automatically identified over 1,200 conflict-related explosions, providing an unprecedented view of hostilities and supporting ceasefire verification efforts. Recent natural earthquakes, such as the magnitude 4.8 event in the Sea of Azov near Crimea on February 2, 2026, and a

magnitude 3.0 near Poltava on February 8, further underscore the need for discrimination techniques to separate tectonic activity from man-made blasts. Ionospheric disturbances linked to missile strikes, observed via complementary Global Navigation Satellite System data, add another layer, showing how seismic insights integrate with other geophysical methods for comprehensive conflict monitoring.

In the Middle East, amid heightened US-Iran nuclear tensions in 2026, seismic monitoring has addressed speculations around potential covert tests. A magnitude 4.5 earthquake struck Bushehr province on February 16, near Iran's sole operational nuclear power plant, sparking online claims of a nuclear detonation due to its proximity and timing during stalled diplomatic talks. However, waveform analysis from regional stations, including those in Turkey and Jordan, revealed classic tectonic signatures: complex phases with strong S-waves and a depth of about 10 kilometers, consistent with fault movement rather than an explosive point source. Similarly, a magnitude 5.3 quake in southern Iran earlier in the year and a 5.5 event further fueled rumors, but studies using moment tensor inversions confirmed natural origins tied to the Arabia-Eurasia plate collision. These incidents echo a 2024 Semnan earthquake, initially misattributed to a test but debunked as fault-driven. Seismic data has also monitored infrastructure changes, such as fortifications at sites like Parchin and Natanz, where post-2025 war repairs might mask activities, though no explosive signatures have been detected. This application demonstrates seismic networks' value in verifying compliance and dispelling false alarms in a region where satellite imagery shows ongoing military enhancements.

Hypothetically, if a tactical nuclear device were deployed in these conflicts, seismic monitoring would provide immediate detection. In Ukraine, a low-yield surface burst near the front lines might register as a magnitude 3-4 event with a sharp P-wave spike, weak S-waves, and zero depth, captured by perimeter stations like those in Romania or Kazakhstan. Cross-verification with the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization's infrasound arrays could confirm atmospheric propagation, alerting international responders within minutes. In the Middle East, a similar use against Iranian facilities could produce an impulsive signature detectable by Jordanian or Omani stations, distinguishing it from frequent natural quakes through uniform first motions and spectral analysis. Such scenarios highlight vulnerabilities, like data gaps in sanctioned areas, but also the resilience of global networks in prompting diplomatic interventions.

These case studies affirm seismic monitoring's efficacy in real and potential crises, offering objective data to navigate the complexities of modern warfare and prevent escalation.

11. Future Directions and Technological Enhancements

The field of seismic monitoring for tactical nuclear events is poised for transformative advancements, driven by rapid technological progress and the imperative to address escalating global threats. As conflicts in regions like the Middle East and Ukraine persist, future directions emphasize enhancing detection speed, accuracy, and accessibility through innovative integrations. Emerging trends such as artificial intelligence integration, satellite augmentation, and supportive policy frameworks promise to overcome current limitations, including data sparsity and interpretation challenges. By fostering interdisciplinary collaborations among scientists, engineers, and policymakers, these enhancements could elevate seismic networks from reactive tools to proactive guardians of international security, potentially deterring nuclear escalation through transparent verification.

Artificial intelligence integration represents a cornerstone of future seismic monitoring, automating and refining processes that traditionally rely on human expertise. Machine learning algorithms, trained on vast datasets of historical waveforms, can classify events in real-time with unprecedented precision, distinguishing explosions from earthquakes by analyzing subtle features like spectral content and phase arrivals. For instance, convolutional neural networks could process raw data streams from global stations, flagging anomalies within seconds and reducing false positives that plague manual reviews. Deep learning models might also predict plume paths or yield estimates by correlating seismic signals with environmental variables, aiding rapid response in conflict zones. Edge computing on sensors themselves could enable on-site AI processing, minimizing latency in disrupted areas where data transmission is unreliable. As AI evolves, ethical considerations, such as bias mitigation in training data from underrepresented regions, will be crucial to ensure equitable global application. Pilot programs, like those exploring AI in the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization's data center, suggest that by 2030, automated systems could handle 90 percent of initial detections, freeing experts for complex verifications.

Satellite augmentation offers another promising avenue, extending seismic coverage beyond ground-based limitations through space-borne technologies. Next-generation satellites equipped with interferometric synthetic aperture radar and gravimeters can detect surface deformations from underground explosions, providing complementary data to traditional seismometers. For example, constellations like those from emerging low-Earth orbit networks could monitor remote or hostile areas in the Middle East, where installing ground stations is politically infeasible. Integration with global navigation satellite systems, already used for ionospheric disturbance detection in missile launches, could triangulate events with centimeter-level accuracy. Hyperspectral imaging from satellites might identify post-explosion thermal anomalies or vegetation changes, cross-validating seismic findings. Challenges include orbital

congestion and data fusion complexities, but advancements in quantum sensors promise hypersensitive detection from space. Collaborative projects, such as those between space agencies and seismic consortia, aim to create hybrid systems that blend orbital observations with terrestrial networks, enhancing resilience against ground-level sabotage in Ukraine-like scenarios.

Policy recommendations are essential to realize these technological enhancements and improve global access to seismic data. International agreements should prioritize open-data initiatives, mandating real-time sharing among signatories to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and beyond, reducing silos that hinder verification in tense regions. Funding mechanisms, like multilateral grants for deploying AI-enabled stations in developing countries, could address distribution inequities, ensuring comprehensive coverage in data-poor areas. Educational policies promoting citizen science, through subsidies for devices like Raspberry Shakes, would democratize participation and build grassroots resilience. Regulatory frameworks must enforce cybersecurity standards to protect networks from state-sponsored hacks, while ethical guidelines govern AI use to prevent misuse in surveillance. Diplomatic efforts, such as confidence-building measures in nuclear negotiations, could incorporate seismic data transparency as a trust-building tool. By advocating for these policies, organizations like the United Nations could foster a more inclusive monitoring ecosystem, ultimately contributing to arms control and conflict prevention.

In summary, the synergy of AI, satellites, and forward-thinking policies heralds a new era for seismic monitoring, equipping humanity with tools to navigate the uncertainties of tactical nuclear risks. These directions not only amplify technical capabilities but also promote equitable global cooperation for a safer world.

12. Conclusion and Policy Implications

This paper has explored the critical role of real-time seismic monitoring in detecting tactical nuclear events within global conflict zones, particularly the Middle East and Ukraine. Synthesizing the findings reveals a clear trajectory: from the historical evolution of nuclear detection technologies during the Cold War to contemporary digital networks, seismic methods have emerged as superior for their immediacy, resilience, and discriminatory power. Limitations of radiation monitoring, such as inherent delays in plume detection and regional data gaps, underscore the necessity for alternatives that capture explosive signatures instantaneously. Seismic principles, including the analysis of P-waves and S-waves, enable precise differentiation between explosions and natural earthquakes, as demonstrated through key international

networks like the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization's International Monitoring System and the Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology Station Monitor.

The examination of specific systems, from the United States Geological Survey's automated detection to GEOFON's regional focus and the Raspberry Shake Network's decentralized approach, highlights a multifaceted ecosystem that provides comprehensive coverage. Step-by-step data interpretation methods, bolstered by case studies from ongoing conflicts, illustrate practical applications where seismic insights have debunked misinformation and informed responses. Looking ahead, emerging trends in artificial intelligence integration and satellite augmentation promise to further enhance accuracy and accessibility, addressing current challenges in data sparsity and real-time processing.

Central to mitigating nuclear risks is the imperative for public education, which empowers individuals and communities to engage with these technologies. Awareness campaigns should demystify seismic data, teaching basic waveform analysis and event discrimination through accessible platforms and school curricula. By fostering a scientifically literate populace, societies can better recognize early warnings, reducing panic from false alarms and encouraging participation in citizen science initiatives. In regions like Ukraine, where conflict disrupts daily life, educational programs could integrate seismic monitoring into civil defense training, enabling residents to contribute data via affordable devices. Similarly, in the Middle East, where geopolitical sensitivities limit official sensors, public involvement could bridge gaps, promoting transparency and trust. Governments and non-governmental organizations must invest in multilingual resources, online tutorials, and community workshops to build this knowledge base, ensuring that seismic monitoring becomes a tool for collective vigilance rather than an elite domain.

Equally vital is international cooperation, which forms the bedrock of effective nuclear risk mitigation. The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization exemplifies successful multilateralism, but broader collaboration is needed to standardize data sharing protocols and expand network coverage in underrepresented areas. Policy implications include advocating for amendments to existing treaties that mandate real-time access for all nations, regardless of political alignments, to prevent data withholding during crises. Joint funding mechanisms could support the deployment of hybrid systems combining ground-based seismometers with satellite technologies, particularly in conflict-prone zones. Diplomatic efforts should prioritize confidence-building measures, such as shared training exercises among adversaries, to normalize seismic data as a neutral verifier. Organizations like the United Nations could facilitate forums for policy dialogue, integrating seismic monitoring into arms control agendas. Moreover, incentives for private-sector involvement, through partnerships with tech companies for

artificial intelligence development, would accelerate innovations while ensuring ethical standards.

In conclusion, the synthesis of these elements points to seismic monitoring as an indispensable pillar of global security in an era of heightened nuclear threats. By prioritizing public education and international cooperation, stakeholders can harness its full potential, transforming technical capabilities into actionable strategies for peace. This proactive stance not only mitigates immediate risks but also contributes to long-term deterrence, fostering a world where the shadows of tactical nuclear warfare are illuminated and diminished through shared knowledge and unity.

References

Dahlman, O., Mykkeltveit, S., & Haak, H. (2009). Nuclear test ban: Converting political visions to reality. Springer.

Dando, B. D. E., et al. (2023). Identifying attacks in the Russia–Ukraine conflict using seismic array data. Nature, 621(7980), 512–517.

De Geer, L.-E. (2012). Radionuclide evidence for low-yield nuclear testing in North Korea in April/May 2010. Science & Global Security, 20(1), 1–29.

Ellefsen, K. J., et al. (2005). Evaluation of shear-wave refraction surveys for unconsolidated materials. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2005-1170.

Gaebler, P., et al. (2019). A multi-technology analysis of the 2017 North Korean nuclear test. Solid Earth, 10(1), 59–78.

Gibbons, S. J., & Ringdal, F. (2017). Seismic monitoring of the North Korea nuclear test site using a multichannel correlation detector. IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 55(4), 1897–1909.

Goodwin, M. A., et al. (2024). Review radionuclide measurements of the international monitoring system. Journal of Environmental Radioactivity, 271, 107324.

Hassan, E. M., & Mahmoud, H. (2020). Resilience of school systems following severe earthquakes. Earth's Future, 8(11), e2020EF001518.

Hetényi, G., et al. (2023). A call to action for a comprehensive earthquake education policy in Nepal. Seismica, 2(2), 242.

Koper, K. D., et al. (2024). Classifying small earthquakes, explosions and collapses. Geophysical Journal International, 239(2), 1257–1272.

Kværna, T., & Ringdal, F. (2013). Detection capability of the seismic network of the International Monitoring System for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 103(2A), 759–772.

Liu, J., et al. (2018). North Korea's 2017 test and its nontectonic aftershock. Geophysical Research Letters, 45(7), 3017–3025.

Mukhopadhyay, S., et al. (2021). Implementation of the International Radiation Monitoring Information System at a national level. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Scientific and Technical Information.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2012). The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty: Technical issues for the United States. The National Academies Press.

Office of Inspector General. (2012). Weaknesses in EPA's management of the Radiation Network System demand attention. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Report No. 12-P-0417.

Park, J., et al. (2012). Global satellite detection of nuclear explosions. American Geophysical Union Fall Meeting Abstracts, S51A-2392.

Plevris, V., et al. (2024). AI-driven innovations in earthquake risk mitigation: A future-focused perspective. Geosciences, 14(9), 244.

Przybylak, J. (2024). Nuclear power plants in war zones: Lessons learned from the war in Ukraine. Security and Defence Quarterly, 42(2), 174810.

Richards, P. G., & Kim, W.-Y. (2009). Monitoring for nuclear explosions. Scientific American, 300(3), 70–77.

Richards, P. G., & Zavales, J. (1990). Seismic discrimination of nuclear explosions. Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences, 18(1), 257–303.

Ross, O., et al. (2023). Seismic stations detected explosion at Ukrainian dam around the time it collapsed. NORSAR Report.

Scaini, C., et al. (2022). Can high-school students contribute to seismic risk mitigation? Lessons learned from the development of a crowd-sourced exposure database. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 68, 102706.

Sokolski, H. (2022). Nuclear power plants as weapons for the enemy: U.S. security failures. Nonproliferation Policy Education Center.

Sykes, L. R., & Richards, P. G. (2010). Seismology. In Science for security: Verifying the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (pp. 5–20). CTBTO Preparatory Commission.

Wang, R., et al. (2020). Seismic discrimination of controlled explosions and earthquakes near Mount St. Helens using P/S ratios. Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, 125(10), e2020JB020338.

Xu, H., et al. (2024). Remote sensing through the fog of war: Infrastructure damage and environmental change during the Russian-Ukrainian conflict revealed by open-access data. Remote Sensing Applications: Society and Environment, 33, 101149.

Zolkaffly, M. Z., et al. (2019). The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT): Seismic monitoring. IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, 555(1), 012010.

The author has published over 5,000 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.